

**Re: Draft FS Cost Tool** 

**Elizabeth Allen** to: Kristine Koch

04/15/2011 02:30 PM

History: This message has been replied to.

Kristine,

I decided to start by looking at what we currently have as a good baseline.

To save you from having to look it up, here a summary of resident fish sampling. For PH, resident fish are Smallmouth bass, Black crappie, Brown bullhead, and Common carp. In Round 1 (and somehow it seems appropriate that it sounds like we're talking about a boxing match), Smallmouth bass were collected from 8 locations across RM-2-9. One whole body composite sample and one fillet composite sample were collected at five river mile locations, at the remaining 3 locations three whole body replicate composite samples were collected. I'm not entirely clear how many fish comprised each composite, though in Round 3 it was 5 fish for each one. Black crappie, common carp, and brown bullhead were collected to represent RM 3-6 and RM 6-9. For each of those 2 zones, three whole-body and fillet composites were collected for carp and bullhead, two each for crappie.

In Round 3, one bass whole body and fillet samples (and the whole Frankenfish re-animations) were collected for each RM 2-12, east and/or west side, for a total of 18 stations. Three carp samples were collected representing RMs 0-4, 4-8, 8-12. We'll need to decide whether we want shellfish added to the monitoring. There are only 6 RM on the west side, and 2 RM on the east side where clam consumption at 18 g/day did not exceed a 10-4 risk, though there would be the argument of depurated versus depurated samples as the basis for that conclusion.

For a starting point in the FS, I'd suggest we reproduce the round 3 data. So that's 18 bass composites (five fish each), and 3 carp. Twenty-one in all, 6 more than LWG proposed. I'd suggest at least one round of this sampling for each 5-Year Review as a minimum. The carp will represent the bottom-feeding fish you indicated you'd like sampled.

One other issue is that I only see is that the "Biota tissue monitoring" is proposed only for the MNR alternative. I'm not clear why such sampling isn't proposed for all the alternatives save no-action.

Elizabeth

Kristine Koch

[All - Here is the document I was discussing. Ple...](#)

04/06/2011 11:23:23 AM

From: Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US  
To: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Elizabeth Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Rene Fuentes/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 04/06/2011 11:23 AM  
Subject: Draft FS Cost Tool

All - Here is the document I was discussing. Please look over the assumptions for monitoring and see if you agree. If not, please provide different assumptions (we don't need details at this point) for our comments. Comments are due April 15.

[attachment "Costing FS Tools Memo\_15Mar2011.pdf" deleted by Elizabeth Allen/R10/USEPA/US]

Thanks,

Kristine Koch  
Remedial Project Manager  
USEPA, Office of Environmental Cleanup

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region 10  
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, M/S ECL-115  
Seattle, Washington 98101-3140

(206)553-6705  
(206)553-0124 (fax)  
1-800-424-4372 extension 6705 (M-F, 8-4 Pacific Time, only)